

4/2



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/054,863	01/25/2002	Mitsuhiro Ishizuka	Q68243	7583

7590 12/14/2004  
SUGHRUE, MION, ZINN, MACPEAK & SEAS  
2100 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.  
Washington, DC 20037

EXAMINER

NGUYEN, JENNIFER T

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2674

DATE MAILED: 12/14/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

# Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/054,863

Applicant(s)

ISHIZUKA ET AL.

Examiner

Jennifer T Nguyen

Art Unit

2674

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 1/25/2002.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-31 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☐ Claim(s) 1-5, 10-16, 21-23, 26-29 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 6-9, 17-20, 24, 25, 30 and 31 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 25 January 2002 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

## Attachment(s)

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)   | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)             |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>01/25/2002</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

### DETAILED ACTION

1. This Office action is responsive to amendment filed on 09/14/2004.

#### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102*

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

3. Claims 1, 12, 21, and 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Fujisaki et al. (US Patent No. 5,583,527).

Regarding claims 1, 12, 21, and 27, referring to Figs. 1-4, Fujisaki teaches a plasma display (1), comprising: a plasma display panel (30), which includes: first and second substrates (12,13) arranged to face with each other; scanning electrodes (15) and common electrodes (14) alternately provided with each other on a side of said first substrate facing said second substrate and extending in a first direction; and data electrodes (16) provided on a side of said second substrate facing said first substrate and extending in a second direction across said first direction; data drivers which apply data pulse to said data electrodes; a control circuit (35) which controls operation of said data drivers based on a video signal (from col. 8, line 40 to col. 9, line 15); and a protection signal output circuit (3) which outputs a first protection signal to said control circuit (35) when sum of currents supplied from said data drivers to said data electrodes within a time span exceeds a previously set first specified current value, wherein said first protection signal restrains the operation of said data drivers (col. 9, line 20 to col. 10, line 59); wherein said time

Art Unit: 2674

span is greater than or equal to one sub-field; and wherein said time span is less than one frame to (col. 9, lines 55-58 and col. 10, lines 1-3).

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 4, 5, 15, 16, 23, and 29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fujisaki et al. (US Patent No. 5,583,527) in view of Awamoto et al. (Japan Patent 11-038930).

Regarding claims 4, 5, 15, 16, 23, and 29, Fujisaki differs from claims 4, 5, 15, 16, 23, and 29 in that he does not specifically teach judgment when a temperature around said data drivers exceeds a previously set specified temperature. However, Awamoto teaches protection signal output circuit (31c) starts judgment when a temperature around said data drivers exceeds a previously set specified temperature [0015]-[0023]. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the judgment when a temperature around said data drivers exceeds a previously set specified temperature as taught by Awamoto in the system of Fujisaki in order to control power source voltage, resulting reduce power consumption.

6. Claims 2, 3, 13, 14, 22, and 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fujisaki et al. (US Patent No. 5,583,527) in view of Tonio et al. (Patent No.: US 6,522,314).

Regarding claims 2, 3, 13, 14, 22, and 28, Fujisaki further teaches the protection signal output circuit (3) judges whether or not a current supplied from at least one data driver among said data drivers and the protection signal restraining the operation of said one data driver (from col. 8, line 40 to col. 10, line 59).

Fujisaki differs from claims 2, 3, 13, 14, 22, and 28 in that he does not specifically teach a set second specified current value, and outputs a second protection signal to said control circuit when the current supplied to said one data driver has exceeded said second specified current value, said second protection signal restraining the operation of said one data driver. However, Tonio teaches comparing a current value with a first specific value and second specific value (col. 1, line 66 to col. 2, line 4). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the comparing a current value with a first specific value and second specific value as taught Tonio in the system of Fujisaki in order reduce the power loss in data driver more effectively.

7. Claims 10, 11, and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fujisaki et al. (US Patent No. 5,583,527) in view of Kuriyama et al. (US Patent No. 5,956,014).

Regarding claims 10, 11, and 26, Fujisaki differs from claims 10, 11, and 26 in that he does not specifically teach the protection signal output circuit is comprises a microcomputer. However, referring to Fig. 8, Kuriyama teaches a protection signal output circuit (201) is comprises a microcomputer (213). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the microcomputer as taught by Kuriyama in the system of Fujisaki in order to control output of protection signal output circuit, wherein the power consumption is reduced.

Art Unit: 2674

8. Claims 6-9, 17-20, 24, 25, 30, and 31 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

9. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-20 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

***Conclusion***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to **Jennifer T. Nguyen** whose telephone number is **703-305-3225**. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri from 9:00-5:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, **Richard A Hjerpe** can be reach at **703-305-4709**.

**Any response to this action should be mailed to:**

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Washington, DC. 20231

**Or faxed to: 703-872-9306 (for Technology Center 2600 only)**

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive, Arlington, VA, sixth-floor (Receptionist).

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Technology Center 2600 Customer Service Office whose telephone number is 703-306-0377.

JNguyen  
12/10/2004

  
REGINA LIANG  
PRIMARY EXAMINER